

In claim 5, line 12, “, on which peel off glues are adhered,” should be canceled.

In claim 5, line 13, “the second portion” should be “a second portion”.

In claim 5, line 14, “, on which peel off glue is attached,” should be canceled.

In claim 5, line 16, “the center” should be “a center”.

In claim 5, line 22, “second portions” should be “second portion”.

In claim 5, line 24, “third and fourth portion” should be “third and fourth portions”.

In claim 5, line 25, “slightly press the folded card with hands” is awkward and should be rewritten. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 5 is amended appropriately.

Claim Rejections-35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Stating in claim 5, line 7, “trapezoid form, whose maximum height is half of that of the rectangular form” is considered to be new matter since the specification and drawings, as originally filed, fail to provide support for the newly added language.

The wording “whose maximum height is half of that of the rectangular form” is deleted.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 5, line 4, “ a window of various shape” is confusing since it is not

understood how a single window can have various shape, i.e. a window can only include a single shape. The applicant could cancel the phrase “of various shape” to overcome the indefinite problem.

In claim 5, lines 5-6, the following phrase is awkward and confusing “ on which peel off glues are attached, are developed on the three edges”, i.e. it is not clear what “ developed on the three edges” means.

In claim 5, line 10, “ threads of different color, decorated fabric” is awkward and confusing.

In claim 5, line 11, “six pieces of peel off glues” is indefinite since it is not clear whether the six pieces of peel off glue are part of the peel off glues defined earlier in the claim or are additional peel off glues.

In claim 5, line 11, “ by; a) folding” is awkward and confusing. In claim 5, line 14, there is no antecedent basis for “the wing”.

In claim 5, lines 14-15, there is no antecedent basis for “the fourth portion”.

In claim 5, line 15, it is not clear which wing is being referred to in the phrase “the wing face”.

In claim 5, line 19, there is no antecedent basis for the “peels”.

In claim 5, line 20, there is no antecedent basis for “the embroidered fabrics”.

In claim 5, lines 22-23, “of the card stock face each other, and third and fourth portion of the card stock face each other” is awkward and confusing.

In claim 5, line 24, there is no antecedent basis for “the folded card”.